

Search Authors...



Translate Website

Search...



GR Newsletter, Enter Email



US Nato War Economy Civil Rights Environment Poverty Media Justice 9/11 War Crimes Militarization History Science

## Imperativul Oppenheimer: Normalizarea terorii atomice

De [Dr. Binoy Kampmark](#)

Cercetare globală, 21 august 2023

Regiunea: SUA

Tema: Istorie, Informații, Militarizare și ADM



Translate Website



Toate articolele Global Research pot fi citite în 51 de limbi prin activarea butonului Traducere site-ul web de sub numele autorului.

Pentru a primi Newsletter-ul zilnic al Global Research (articole selectate), [faceți clic aici](#).

Faceți clic pe butonul de distribuire de mai sus pentru a trimite prin e-mail/redirecționare acest articol prietenilor și colegilor dvs. Urmărește-ne pe [Instagram](#) și [Twitter](#) și abonează-te la [canalul nostru Telegram](#). Simțiți-vă liber să repozați și să distribuiți pe scară largă articolele Global Research.

\*\*\*

*Bomba atomică a creat condițiile catastrofei contingente, punând pentru totdeauna lumea în prăpastia pieirii existențiale. Dar, făcând acest lucru, a creat o filozofie a cruzimii acceptabile, a extincției demne, a exterminării legitime. Scenariile pentru astfel de programe de realizare existențială s-au dovedit nesfărșite. Departamente întregi, școli de găndire și grupuri de găndire au fost dedicate noțiunii absurd de criminale că războiul atomic ar putea fi sustenabil din simplul motiv că cineva (sau unii oameni) ar putea supraviețui. În ciuda marșului necruțător al societății civile împotriva armelor nucleare, o astfel de găndire insidioasă persistă cu o anumită nebunie obstinată.*

Este nevoie doar de o scurtă călătorie în literatura anterioară a nebulilor nucleari pentru a realiza că de atrăgătoare s-a dovedit a fi o astfel de găndire. Dar a avut provocările sale. John Hersey s-a dovedit amenințător cu spectaculosul său din 1946 din New York, „Hiroshima”, vivificând ororile apărute în urma bombardamentelor atomice ale orașului japonez prin ochii unui număr de supraviețuitori. În februarie 1947, fostul **secretar de război Henry Stimson** a tras o propunere de contracarare în Harper's, încercând astfel să normalizeze o armă spectaculos de vicioasă din punct de vedere al necesității și al funcției; folosirea bombelor împotriva Japoniei a salvat vieți, deoarece orice invazie ar fi costat „peste un milion de victime, numai pentru forțele americane”. Aliații, a presupus el, „s-ar confrunta cu enorma sarcină de a distrugere o forță armată de cinci milioane de oameni și cinci mii de avioane sinucigașe, aparținând unei rase care și-a demonstrat deja pe deplin capacitatea de a lupta literalmente până la moarte”.

Inadvertent as it was, the Stimson rationale for justifying theatrical never-to-be-repeated mass murder to prevent mass murder fell into the bloodstream of popular strategic thinking. Albert Wohlstetter's *The Delicate Balance of Terror* chews over the grim details of acceptable extermination, wondering about the meaning of extinction and whether the word means what it's meant to, notably in the context of nuclear war. “Would not a general thermonuclear war mean ‘extinction; for the aggressor as well as the defender? ‘Extinction’ is a state that badly needs analysis.” Wohlstetter goes on to make a false comparison, citing 20 million Soviet deaths in non-atomic conflict during the Second World War as an example of astonishing resilience: the country, in short, recovered “extremely well from the catastrophe.”

Resilience becomes part of the semantics of contemplated, and acceptable mass homicide. Emphasis is placed on the bounce-back factor, the ability to recover, even in the face of such weapons. These were themes that continued to feature. The 1958 report of the National Security Council's Net Evaluation Subcommittee pondered what might arise from a Soviet attack in 1961 involving 553 nuclear weapons with a total yield exceeding 2,000 megatons. The conclusion: 50 million Americans would perish in the conflagration, with nine million left sick or injured. The Sino-Soviet bloc would duly receive retaliatory attacks that would kill 71 million people. A month later, a further 196 million would die. In such macabre calculations, the authors of the report could still breezily conclude that “[t]he balance of strength would be on the side of the United States.”

Modern nuclear strategy, in terms of such normalised, clinical lunacy, continues to find form in the tolerance of tactical weapons and modernised arsenals. To be tactical is to be somehow bijou, cute, and contained, accepting mass murder under the guise of moderation and variation. One can be bad, but bad within limits. Such lethal wonders are [described](#), according to a number of views assembled in *The New York Times*, as “much less destructive” in nature, with “variable explosive yields that could be dialed up or down depending on the military situation.”

The journal *Nature* [prefers](#) a grimmer assessment, suggesting the ultimate calamity of firestorms, excessive soot in the atmosphere, disruption of food production systems, the contamination of soil and water supplies, nuclear winter, and broader climatic catastrophe.

Some of these views are teasingly touched on in Christopher Nolan's *Oppenheimer*, a three-hour cross narrative jumble boisterously expansive and noisy (the music refuses to leave you alone, bruising the senses). While the idea of harnessing an exceptional, exterminating power haunts the scientific community, the Manhattan Project is ultimately functional: developing the atom for military purposes before Hitler does. Once developed, the German side of the equation becomes irrelevant. **The urgent quest for creating the atomic weapon becomes the basis for using it. Once left to politics and military strategy, such weapons are normalised, even relativised as simply other instruments in inflicting destruction.** *Oppenheimer* leaves much room to that lunatic creed, though somehow grants the chief scientist moral absolution.

This is a tough proposition, given Oppenheimer's membership of the Scientific Panel of the Interim Committee that would, eventually, convince President Harry Truman to use the bombs. In their June 16, 1945 [recommendations](#), Oppenheimer, along with Enrico Fermi, Arthur H. Compton and Ernest O. Lawrence, acknowledged dissenting scientific opinions preferring "a purely technical demonstration to that of a purely military application best designed to induce surrender." The scientific panel proved unequivocal: it could "propose no technical demonstration likely to bring an end to the war; we see no acceptable alternative to direct military use."

In the film, those showing preference for a purely technical demonstration are given the briefest of airings. Leó Szilárd's [petition](#) arguing against a military use "at least not until the terms which will be imposed after the war on Japan were made public in detail and Japan were given an opportunity to surrender" makes a short and sharp appearance, only to vanish. As Seiji Yamada [writes](#), that petition led a short, charmed life, first circulated in the Metallurgical Laboratory in Chicago, only to make its way to Edward Teller at Los Alamos, who then turned it over to Oppenheimer. The petition was, in turn, surrendered to the Manhattan Project's chief overseer, General Leslie Groves, who "stamped it 'classified' and put it in a safe. It therefore never reached Truman."

Nolan depicts the relativisation argument in some detail – one that justifies mass death in the name of technical prowess – during an interrogation by US circuit judge Roger Robb, appointed as special counsel during the 1954 security hearing against Oppenheimer. In the relevant scene, Robb wishes to trap the hapless scientist for his opposition to creating a weapon of even greater murderous power than the fission devices used against Japan. Why oppose the thermonuclear option, prods the special counsel, given your support for the atomic one? And why did he not oppose the remorseless firebombing raids of Tokyo, conducted by conventional weapons?

Nolan also has the vengeful Lewis Strauss, the two-term chairman of the US Atomic Energy Commission, moan that Oppenheimer is the less than saintly figure who managed to get away, ethically, with his atomic exploits while moralising about the relentless march about ever more destructive creations. In that sentiment, the Machiavellian ambition monger has a point: the genie, once out, was never going to be put back in.

\*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

**Dr. Binoy Kampmark** was a Commonwealth Scholar at Selwyn College, Cambridge. He currently lectures at RMIT University. He is a regular contributor to Global Research and Asia-Pacific Research. Email: [bkampmark@gmail.com](mailto:bkampmark@gmail.com)

The original source of this article is Global Research

Copyright © Dr. Binoy Kampmark, Global Research, 2023

#### Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

#### Become a Member of Global Research

#### Related Articles from our Archives

Trailer for 'Oppenheimer': Lt General Leslie Groves (Matt Damon) Challenges Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer (Cillian Murphy)  
3 August 2023

Oppenheimer Biographer Joins Nobel Laureates, Navajo Nation, and Atomic Veterans to Call for Justice for Communities Hurt by Nuclear Weapons Testing and Mining  
25 July 2023

Hiroshima Day: The Movie and the Moment: An Oppenheimer Review Through the Lens of an Anti-War Activist  
6 August 2023



[Translate Website](#)

Articles by:

**Dr. Binoy Kampmark**

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long as the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

www.globalresearch.ca conține materiale protejate prin drepturi de autor a căror utilizare nu a fost întotdeauna autorizată în mod specific de către proprietarul drepturilor de autor. Punem la dispoziția cititorilor noștri un astfel de material în conformitate cu prevederile „utilizării loiale” într-un efort de a promova o mai bună înțelegere a problemelor politice, economice și sociale. Materialul de pe acest site este distribuit fără profit celor care și-au exprimat în prealabil interesul de a-l primi în scop de cercetare și educație. Dacă dorîți să utilizați material protejat prin drepturi de autor în alte scopuri decât „utilizarea loială”, trebuie să solicitați permisiunea proprietarului drepturilor de autor.

Pentru întrebări media: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

Police State & Civil Rights  
History  
9/11 & 'War on Terrorism'  
Media Disinformation

Science and Medicine  
United Nations  
US NATO War Agenda  
Women's Rights